IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA ROCK HILL DIVISION

Anthony Mondrez Thompson,

Civil Action No. 0:22-2016-CMC

Petitioner,

VS.

ORDER

Warden, FCI Edgefield Satellite Camp,

Respondent.

This matter is before the court on Petitioner's *pro se* petition for writ of habeas corpus filed in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. ECF No. 1.

In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 (B)(2)(c), DSC, this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Paige J. Gossett for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On July 18, 2022, the Magistrate Judge issued an Order regarding Amendment of Petition, notifying Petitioner of deficiencies in his Petition and granting him 21 days to file an Amended Petition. ECF No. 7. Petitioner filed an Amended Petition on August 4, 2022. ECF No. 10. On September 1, 2022, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending that the Amended Petition be dismissed without prejudice and without requiring Respondent to file a return, as it fails to state a viable claim. ECF No. 14. The Magistrate Judge advised Petitioner of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. The court has received no objections and the time for filing such has expired.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final determination remains with the court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The court is charged with making a *de novo*

0:22-cv-02016-CMC Date Filed 09/28/22 Entry Number 19 Page 2 of 2

determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection

is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made

by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. See 28

U.S.C. § 636(b). The court reviews the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection.

See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co., 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that

"in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but

instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept

the recommendation.") (citation omitted).

After reviewing the record of this matter, the applicable law, and the Report and

Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, the court agrees with the conclusions of the Magistrate

Judge. Accordingly, the court adopts and incorporates the Report and Recommendation by

reference in this Order and this petition is dismissed without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Cameron McGowan Currie
CAMERON MCGOWAN CURRIE
Senior United States District Judge

Columbia, South Carolina September 28, 2022

2